

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

KEITH D. GOODMAN,	)	CASE NO.: 4:13CV1318
	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	JUDGE JOHN ADAMS
	)	
	)	
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL	)	<b><u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION AND</u></b>
SECURITY,	)	<b><u>ORDER</u></b>
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

This matter comes before the Court on an objection filed by Plaintiff Keith D. Goodman to the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of the Magistrate Judge. This action was referred to the Magistrate Judge for an R&R on Goodman’s Appeal of the Social Security Administration’s decision to deny his claim for disability insurance benefits. On December 31, 2013, Magistrate Judge Armstrong issued her R&R recommending that the Commissioner’s decision be affirmed.

For the reasons stated below, the objection is OVERRULED. The R&R is adopted in whole and the decision of the Commissioner is hereby AFFIRMED.

**I. Standard of Review**

District courts conduct *de novo* review of those portions of a magistrate judge’s R & R to which specific objections are made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, in social security cases, judicial review of a decision by the Commissioner is limited to determining whether the decision is supported by substantial evidence based upon the record as a whole. *Longworth v. Comm’r of Soc. Sec.*, 402 F.3d 591, 595 (6th Cir. 2005). The substantial evidence standard is met if “a reasonable mind might accept the relevant evidence as adequate to support a conclusion.” *Warner v. Comm’r*

*of Soc. Sec.*, 375 F.3d 387, 390 (6th Cir. 2004). If substantial evidence supports the Commissioner's decision, this Court will defer to that finding "even if there is substantial evidence in the record that would have supported an opposite conclusion." *Id.*

## **II. Goodman's Objection**

In his sole objection, Goodman quotes one page from his original merits brief, which itself quotes the hypothetical questions posed by the ALJ to the vocational expert. Goodman then argues:

Counsel respectfully submits that the Magistrate Judge did not adequately deal with this issue of reading at pages 28, 29, and 30 of the Report and Recommendation and for that reason the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge should be rejected, as well as that of the Administrative Law Judge, and Judgment should be entered in favor of the Plaintiff.

Doc. 19 at 3. Goodman fails to identify or even argue any legal error in the analysis performed in the R&R. Moreover, he fails to cite to a single legal authority or even legal theory that suggests error in the R&R. Instead, he states in a conclusory fashion that the R&R did not "adequately" address his original argument. As the objections fails to contain any legal argument, it is akin to no objection at all. The Court finds no error and the objection is **OVERRULED**.

## **III. Conclusion**

Goodman's objection is **OVERRULED**. The Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ADOPTED**. The judgment of the Commissioner is **AFFIRMED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: February 5, 2014

/s/ John R. Adams  
JUDGE JOHN R. ADAMS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE